

Serial No. **10/021,439**

Docket No. **K-0359**

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached drawing includes changes to Fig. 7. This sheet, which includes Fig. 7, places the original sheet including Fig. 7. In Figure 7, previously omitted element descriptive labels have been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Serial No. **10/021,439**

Docket No. **K-0359**

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

### **REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 15, 27 and 28 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended Figure 7 and claims 2, 5, 13, 14 and 25 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-14 and 16-26 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 have been allowed. Claims 14-28 have been provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for double patenting as claiming the same invention as that of claims 14-28 of co-pending Application No. 10/060,256.

#### **Drawings filed February 1, 2002**

Applicant notes that the drawings filed by Applicant on February 1, 2002 have been listed by the PTO as having been filed on December 1, 2002. Applicant respectfully request that this incorrect filing date be changed. Applicant can provide proof of filing in the form of a stamped postcard if necessary.

#### **Allowed Claims**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 1-13.

#### **Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 14-28 have been provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for double patenting as claiming the same invention as that of claims 14-28 of co-pending Application No. 10/060,256. Applicant will allow co-pending Application No. 10/060,256 to go abandoned, therefore, rendering these rejections moot. However, to help further advance prosecution on

Serial No. **10/021,439**

Docket No. **K-0359**

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

the present application, Applicant will address the rejections of claims 14-28 cited in the co-pending application 10/060,256 even though such an art rejection does not exist in this application..

#### Drawing Objections

In the Office Action dated November 1, 2005 for Application No. 10/060,256, the drawings have been objected to because figure 7 lacks descriptive labels. Applicant has amended this figure to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 25 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action dated November 1, 2005 for Application No. 10/060,256 claims 14-24 and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dempo. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Dempo discloses an AAL2 packet exchange device which is placed in front of an ATM switch for executing CPS packet re-multiplexing into ATM cells. The AAL2 packet exchange device extracts CPS-PDUs from ATM cells which are supplied from input ATM lines, extracts CPS packets from the CPS-PDUs, alters CIDs of the CPS packets if necessary so that CID

collision will not occur between CPS packets supplied from different sources to be outputted to the same ATM connection, multiplexes the CPS packets to be outputted to the same ATM connection in ATM cells of the same output ATM connection, and thereby realizes re-multiplexing of CPS packets extracted from ATM cells supplied from different sources into the same ATM connection without the CID collision.

Regarding claims 14 and 16, Applicant submits that Dempo does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Dempo discloses a CPS packet switching unit that reads the stored CPS packets from the first storage areas in the order of the stored first identifiers, at col. 8, lines 11-22 and figure 4. However, these portions merely disclose that the CPS-PDU processing section 15 extracts CPS packets from the CPS-PDU which has been stored in the CPS-PDU FIFO memory 12, and also regenerates a CPS packet which has been split across two CPS-PDUs, using the CPS packet-A memory 16, and that the CPS packet processing section 17 rewrites CID information of each CPS packet supplied from the CPS-PDU processing section 15, and rewrites HAC information of each CPS packet. These portions do not disclose or suggest reading stored CPS packets from first storage areas in the order of stored first identifiers, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Dempo merely disclose that CPS packets are extracted from the CPS-PDU which has been stored in FIFO memory.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Dempo discloses sequentially storing the routed CPS packets into second storage areas, at col. 8, lines 23-31. However, these portions merely disclose that the CPS packet FIFO memory stores the CPS packets outputted by the CPS packet processing section, and that the second FIFO memory stores internal addresses and LI information concerning each of the CPS packets stored in the CPS FIFO memory. This is not a second memory that sequentially stores the routed CPS packets into second storage areas, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely disclose that the CPS packets are stored. These portions do not disclose or suggest sequentially storing or sequentially storing routed CPS packets.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Dempo discloses sequentially storing second identifiers of the second storage areas, in the same portions of Dempo (col. 8, lines 23-31). However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose that the CPS packets outputted by the CPS packet processing section are stored. These portions do not disclose or suggest sequentially storing second identifiers of a second storage area, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Dempo discloses changing CIDs of the CPS packets read from the first storage areas to corresponding destination CIDs and sequentially storing the read CPS packet in the second storage areas corresponding to the destination CIDs, at col. 8, lines 18-22 and fig. 4. However, these portions merely disclose that the CPS packet processing

Serial No. **10/021,439**

Docket No. **K-0359**

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

section rewrites CID information of each CPS packet supplied from the CPS-PDU processing section and rewrites HEC information of each CPS packet. This is not changing origination CIDs of the CPS packets read from the first storage areas to corresponding destination CIDs, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Dempo does not disclose or suggest sequentially storing the read CPS packets in the second storage areas corresponding to the destination CIDs.

Regarding claims 17-26, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on independent claim 16 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reason noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Dempo does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 14 and 16-26 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/021,439**

Docket No. **K-0359**

Amdt. dated February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-14 and 16-26 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg  
**Date: February 1, 2006**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**



FIG. 7

